DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 757 SO 011 917

AUTHOR Naylor, David T.
TITLE Enhancing Global Understanding: A Call for Cooperation.
INSTITUTION Cincinnati Univ., Ohio. Center for Law-Related Education.
PUB DATE 22 Nov 78
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies (Houston, Texas, November 22-25, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperation; Curriculum Evaluation; *Educational Needs; Educational Objectives; Educational Problems; Elementary Secondary Education; *Global Approach; Inquiry Training; *Legal Education; *Social Studies; Student Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Social studies education will improve if educators favoring global education and law-related education replace counterproductive competition with mutual respect and cooperation. As two of the many curricular approaches clamoring for a just share of elementary and secondary school social studies programs, global education and law-related education have much in common. For example, they both are supported by interest groups composed of educators and content experts; they both became frequent course offerings in the wake of the "new" social studies; and they both stress reflective inquiry. Educators will improve social studies education if they use goals, competencies, and approaches common to global education and law-related education as a basis for cooperation in developing curriculum. Specific competencies relevant to both approaches include perceiving individual involvement in a global society, making decisions, making judgments, and exercising influence. A framework centered on concepts such as power, justice, liberty, property, equality, authority, freedom, and responsibility would be equally relevant to law-related education and global education. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED175757

ENHANCING GLOBAL UNDERSTANDING: A CALL FOR COOPERATION.

By David T. Naylor
Associate Professor of Education
University of Cincinnati

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David T. Naylor

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies (Houston, Texas, November 22-25, 1978)

SO-011 917

ENHANCING GLOBAL UNDERSTANDING: A CALL FOR COOPERATION

By Dr. David T. Naylor
Associate Professor of Education
University of Cincinnati
November 22, 1978

Despite the optimistic prophesies of the advocates of the "new social studies", the millennium has not arrived. Instead malaise infects the field, and cries of despair have become widespread. Reporting on a national study he conducted, Richard Gross found that social studies enrollment has not kept pace in the 1970s with the growth of total pupil enrollment in secondary education.[1] The results of a survey of urban high school students published in 1976 confirmed the findings in earlier studies as to the low esteem in which the social studies are held by many high school students.[2]

In many elementary schools across the nation, there is almost no Social Studies taught at all, a point emphasized by Jean Tilford Claugus in her 1975 Presidential Address at the NCSS meeting in Atlanta.[3] In her remarks, Claugus underscored the serious nature of the challenges confronting the social studies by quoting from a letter sent to her from a past president of NCSS as follows: "It is clear in many parts of the country that the Social Studies field is not only in real forment and dilution; it is beyond that, in RETREAT!"[4]

In reporting on the results of his survey which point to a national decline in social studies education, Gross described the field as one plagued by "the increasing discontinuity of the patchwork social studies programs of our times".[5] Characterizing the social studies as a "diffused and balkanized field" suffering from a "lack of purpose and direction",[6] Gross asserted, "I am convinced, unfortunately, that a major force in the decline of the social studies is our own lack of conviction and persuasiveness to the field."[7]

During 1976-77, John Jarolimek coordinated a study on the status of social studies education in the United States. Data was obtained through six case studies of selected areas said to represent a cross-section of American communities of varying sizes and geographic locations.[8] Jarolimek noted that

> the astonishing thing that comes through over and over in these case studies is the great diversity that prevails in social studies education today...It would seem that such diversity and lack of apparent effort to attend to the common culture will have serious consequences for citizenship education unless this trend is reversed.[9]

Robert Barr, James Barth and S. Samuel Shermis suggest that the persistent, fundamental problem facing social studies educators is the lack of a distinctive definition for the field of social studies acceptable to all factions of the field, a situation which contributes significantly to the current malaise infecting social studies education. They note that "The field

of social studies is so caught up in ambiguity, inconsistency, and contradiction that it represents a complex, educational enigma."[10]

In an effort to bring some semblance of order out of what they suggest is often perceived of as a "seamless web" of confusion, Barr, Barth and Shermis identify three traditions in the social studies -- citizenship transmission, social science and reflective inquiry -- which they believe are sufficient to develop a synthesis, or definition, of the social studies field that is "comprehensive enough to include all factions in the field, and yet flexible enough to permit differentiation of various points of view".[11] Yet, despite their well-documented, thought-provoking efforts, they fail to achieve that goal. For as Shirley Engle points out in a reaction published as part of their book, "they have failed to demonstrate convincingly that the unity they sought is either feasible or desirable".[12]

To further emphasize his point, Engle identifies at least two other significant traditions which have had or which are beginning to have profound influence on social studies education -- that of "social criticism" and that of "policy studies" -- which he accuses the authors of ignoring completely.[13] And, another reactor to the book, Dale Brubaker, who in a 1967 book identified two major camps in the social studies,[14] published

a subsequent article in which he and two of his colleagues identified a different five-camp model for viewing the social studies.[15] Hence the search for clarification and the ensuing debate continue.

If educators experience difficulty in attempting to define the field of social studies, they experience as much as, if not greater, difficulty in defining what is meant by the term citizenship education. Long considered a major purpose of American education, citizenship education has traditionally been regarded as a principal concern and responsibility of the social studies. Yet, as Barr, Barth and Shermis point out, "not only do social studies educators have conflicting ideas as to how to create a 'good citizen', they cannot even agree on the meaning of the term".[16] And, some critics such as Martin Mayer, have argued less diplomatically that the net result of such ambiquity is a situation in which

> Anything anybody wants to teach can be defended as necessary for "good citizenship"...As a practical matter, "citizenship" is a hopeless goal for instruction. Any stupidity can be defended as helping to promote it.[17]

While few may be willing to subscribe wholly to Mayer's analysis, the fact remains that there is tremendous diversity and disagreement among social studies educators. Clearly we lack consensus as to what constitutes social studies as a field. Equally clear, beyond general agreement or at least

general acknowledgement that citizenship education is an integral part of the social studies, there is great diversity and disagreement as to what purpose, goals and objectives and what knowledge, attitudes, skills and experiences are essential components of a sound social studies educational program. Given this situation, we tend to respond in the manner suggested by Engle who advised, "the problem in the social studies is not so much the achievement of a common definition as it is the choosing of a definition which best suits our purposes."[18]

Within the past decade we have witnessed a proliferation of courses and approaches in the social studies. Fred Newmann, for example, identifies eight distinct approaches within civic education -- the academic disciplines, social problems, law-related education, critical thinking, values clarification, moral development, community involvement and institutional school reform.[19] Whether we accept Newmann's analysis or not, abundant evidence exists documenting courses, such as Psychology (what Gross reports "is definitely the fastest growing course in the high school social studies program"),[20] Economics and Sociology, which compete with traditional History, Government and Geography courses. And, the competition heightens when one adds other course offerings under the aegis of law-related education, global education, multi-cultural education,

environmental education, career education, or values education.

While such a situation has the potential of producing positive benefits, the reality is that what often results is a crowded curriculum lacking continuity, a conclusion reached by both Gross and Jarolimek. Gross found that "a well integrated scope and sequence just does not exist"[21] in most school systems. And Jarolimek reached a similar conclusion, observing that "carefully coordinated social studies programs that cover the full K-12 range are rare".[22]

Jarolimek contends that what one finds typically in American public schools is "a collection of courses, units, topics, minicourses... that do not have an organizational quality about them that would justify their being called a systematic program".[23] M. Eugene Gilliom and Richard Remy suggest that what is operating in our schools is an "ice-cube tray" conception of curriculum in which

> Courses or units of study are viewed as separate entities, each occupying a special niche in the curriculum. Change comes about only as one cube is removed to be replaced by another.[24]

In another article, Remy adds:

> A natural outgrowth of the interest group approach is the mustering of political support and resources necessary to convince skeptical publishers, school administrators, teachers and others of the validity of the interest being pushed. Great amounts of intellectual talent, and psychological and physical energy are often

> expended on such support building activities. The students' education meanwhile, becomes increasingly fragmented and often bears little relationship to the actual tasks and responsibilities of citizenship.[25]

Increasingly proponents of various curricular approaches are questioning the wisdom of the interest group approach, if for no other reason than the realization that this approach is costly, both in terms of money and energy, time-consuming, and likely to yield small and sporadic success. However, the more typical response to this situation seems to be an escalation of competition which seeks as its goal control of the entire curriculum sequence, a "total war" mentality rather than the seeking of synthesis and accommodation.

The recent article by Gilliom and Remy is a case in point. Arguing for "a new approach to global education", the authors lament the "ice-cube tray" approach and imply that global education has not fared well in interest-group competition. Their proposed solution, their "fresh approach to global education", would have global education infused in all areas of the elementary curriculum - not just the social studies, but in art, mathematics, music and science as well. They argue that global education should have broad parameters which involve the community and other institutions beyond the school. And, as a means of ensuring success, they argue that global education should be infused throughout elementary teacher

education programs.[26] Yet despite escalating tactics and escalating goals, one is hard pressed to distinguish the current interest-group approach Gilliom and Remy condemn from what they propose.

For several years, advocates of law-related education have been proposing a similar "battle plan" as that suggested by Gilliom and Remy. They, too, feel that their approach is of such significance that it should be infused in all areas of the curriculum, not just the social studies, and that it should become an integral part of the curriculum at each level in a K-12 sequence.[27]

At the present time, a major project of the American Bar Association's Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship is that entitled, "Law and the Humanities: A Design for Elementary Education." Financed primarily by a several hundred thousand dollar grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, it is a project which seeks to encourage and support the development of law-related education activities at the elementary school level and the integration of law and the humanities into the elementary curriculum. In papers prepared by and for the distinguished group of educators who participated in a conference sponsored by this project in May, 1978, a comprehensive approach was articulated, an

approach which encompasses many of the same characteristics of the Gilliom-Remy approach for global education but which exceeds it in terms of scope and implementation strategies (e.g., a call for both pre-service and in-service teacher education).

It is important to realize that the Law and Humanities Elementary Education project is but one part of the law-related education effort. A great variety of national, state and local law-related education projects exist, many of which produce curriculum materials, engage in significant, university-based teacher education efforts, and provide support services (e.g., speakers, community field-based experiences, etc.) to aid in implementing law-related curricula. The U.S. Office of Education and the U.S. Congress have become increasingly interested in and inclined to provide financial resources for law-related education. And, some states have made law-related education a required component of the social studies curriculum.

We need to be mindful of the fact that global education and law-related education are but only two of the curricular approaches clamoring for their just share of the elementary and secondary curriculum. Hence one fails to see how an escalation of interest-group curriculum competition can lead to a successful resolution of the difficulties confronting

each of these approaches in particular and social studies education in general.

It is time that the strategy of interest group turf fights be rejected in favor of a new strategy which seeks accommodation and synthesis. The contributions of Barr, Barth and Shermis remind us of the difficulties involved, pointing out that current definitions/conceptions "represent distinct competing, philosophical systems, each attempting to establish itself as the principal approach to social studies."[28] Common sense and educational experience make clear the futility and undesirability of pushing for a monolithic approach. But there is a middle ground for curriculum reform between the ice-cube tray and the solid ice block approaches.

Much can be gained by opening and improving lines of communication between proponents of global education and proponents of other curricular approaches such as law-related education. Yet efforts of this nature, for all of their potential and appeal, seem extremely difficult to realize. Undoubtedly vested interests combine with varying philosophic and educational beliefs and assumptions to do much to frustrate such efforts. At present, indifference and outright hostility frequently prevail among advocates of the various curricular approaches. Yet each has much to offer the other. By combining efforts, the goals of each or at least some are more

likely to be realized and more logical, carefully sequenced, effective curricula will be available for implementation in our elementary and secondary schools. To illustrate this point, the remainder of this paper will explore some possible areas of accommodation between global education and law-related education.

Much of the current disagreement between advocates of global education and advocates of law-related education may be subsumed under the title of this session, "Global Versus National Perspectives in Social Education". Many see law-related education as being rooted deeply in what Barr, Barth and Shermis describe as the tradition of social studies as citizenship transmission, a tradition they describe as one in which

> Teachers begin with a set of assumptions, beliefs and expectations about their own society. The teacher knows the important philosophical goals; knows how people ought to relate to each other, what is considered desirable behavior, and what the culture rewards and punishes; and, finally, knows what the culture considers to be the best form of social participation.[29]

They add that

> For those transmitting a clear view of citizenship, mainstream values tend to be equated with acceptance and internalization of certain norms, beliefs and values, obedience to laws, and participation in approved activities.[30]

For many, then, law-related education is afflicted with an inescapable national bias. Ethnocentric in design and purpose,

it seeks predetermined outcomes -- respect for and belief in the superiority of the American legal system. To achieve this end, "knowledge, assumptions and beliefs...are treated as self evident truths which need to be accepted at face value". It is, therefore, but one of a series of recently formed nation-wide curriculum approaches promoted by special interest groups -- in this case, the American Bar Association and its affiliates-- which seek to ensure that their special interests are included and perpetuated in the social studies curriculum.

There is evidence to confirm this perception, for a number of school-based law-related education programs clearly subscribe to the tradition of citizenship transmission. But one must be cognizant that "most teachers belong to that tradition we call citizenship transmission".[31] Law-related education does not stand alone. The strength of this tradition is such that it encompasses social studies instruction in all of the variety of curriculum approaches described above, including that of global education.[32]

To characterize law-related education solely in the tradition of citizenship transmission is to misread and misinterpret much of what constitutes law-related education. The tradition of reflective inquiry is firmly rooted in law-related education programs. Law-related education need not -- and in my opinion, should not - regard students as but mere vessels into which

predigested "truths" are poured and out of which they are periodically ladled. Decision-making is an essential component of law-related programs, indeed it is one of the very strengths of the program. As Isidore Starr observes

> Law studies, by their very nature, force students and teachers to grapple with and analyze the issues in a value conflict. What is especially intriguing about law is that it often forces us to choose between two desirable values...The problem here is which of the good values deserve priority in our hierarchy of values at a given time and place.[33]

Star stresses the emphasis law-related education places upon inquiry, "an honest search for answers to important questions...a never-ending search for viable alternatives in real-life situations...an attitude that recognizes that all of life is the story of never-ending value differences, forcing us to live with questions that defy instant solutions".[34] What he describes is a very different kind of law-related education from that suggested above; it is this approach to law-related education which is supported by its principal proponents, including the American Bar Association. And, it is this kind of approach which forms a basis for accommodation with global education and other curricular programs.

Another area of concern about law-related education is that it has failed to include an international dimension. Emphasis has been placed, almost exclusively, upon domestic

legal processes and procedures. Rarely, if ever, are students asked to explore questions related to laws in other nations or to international law.

This omission is a serious concern. What occurs in American schools as a result of such an omission is that, as Judith Torney observes

> American children, almost without exception, are exposed to the concept of rights only in the context of the U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights. Because the U.S. Constitution, and not the Universal Declaration [1948 United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights] is the source of all the examples of rights, it should not be too surprising to find that American children have a certain natio-centrism, and view human rights as an American invention and monopoly.[35]

Developing this idea more fully, Torney identifies several serious consequences of law-related education programs which fail to include an international dimension. One consequence is that American students are prone to view the American political and legal system as the only important framework for defining rights. Another consequence is that by failing to deal with, or even acknowledge the existence of, the concept of international human rights, this concept becomes invisible to students and they fail to understand its role in human affairs. A third consequence is the inability of students to understand that there are certain human rights which transcend national state boundries and cultural relativism, rights which are shared widely within the human community.[36]

In an article describing global education in American elementary schools, Charlotte and Lee Anderson suggest that two approaches dominate.[37] One approach treats global education as the study of foreign peoples and cultures, an approach Torney criticizes for failing to help students understand that there are certain values and matters of basic human rights which are widely shared within the human community.[38] The other approach treats global education as the study of foreign policies and international relations of national governments. In this approach, law and human rights, even within the context of the United States, are often neglected and ignored and discussions of international law are virtually nonexistent.

Rejecting both of these approaches to global education as inadequate, the Andersons suggest that a more adequate conception of global education is one in which global education is seen

> as education for responsible citizenship involvement and effective participation in a global society....an extension and enlargement of the school's traditional, time-honored responsibility of preparing children for responsible and effective citizenship. We must continue to try to prepare children for citizenship in local communities and nations, but now we must also educate them for responsible involvement and effective participation in global society.

If law-related education is to be indicted for its failure

to expand its parameters beyond the American legal system, so too must global education stand indicted for its failure to incorporate cognitive and affective dimensions of law-related education in its approaches.

In order for children to eventually become effective participants in a global society, the Andersons suggest four types of competencies need to be developed: (1) competence in perceiving one's involvement in a global society; (2) competence in making decisions; (3) competence in making judgments; and, (4) competence in exercising influence.[40] Given this goal and these specific competencies, it is inconceivable that law-related education can be regarded as anything but an integral component of such an approach for at least three of these competencies lie at the heart of contemporary law-related programs. And, the fourth competency is one which has already been identified as an area which needs to be addressed.

Crime is a universal phenomena. Concern for human rights is international in scope. In recent years, both have become more pronounced on a global scale. Programs which seek to prepare young people to become effective participants in either American society or in a global society cannot afford to ignore either. And these are but two areas in which the interests and concerns of those involved in global education and those involved in law-related education are merged.

Starr suggests a framework for viewing law and the humanities built around five major ideas -- power, justice, liberty, property, and equality.[41] Each are global in scope and consequence. So too are the eight seminal concepts emphasized by the Law in a Free Society project in California -- authority, justice, privacy, property, freedom, diversity, responsibility, and participation.[42]

Torney suggests that schools should introduce the concept of human rights by first studying the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and then the U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights. By this approach, students would first consider how human rights have been defined by people throughout the world and then proceed to consider how human rights are defined by American institutions. She notes the advantages of going from the general to the specific and suggests that such an approach would provide a powerful component to educational programs, a powerful global and humankind perspective.[43]

Whatever the approach and the specific components, it is clear that we can no longer afford to regard global education and law-related education as discrete entities. We must resist inclinations to treat the two as competitors rather than partners, as ice-cubes to be added to or removed from the school's ice-cube curriculum tray on the basis of political

strength or economic resources. Each are integrally related to the other. Counterproductive competition must give way to mutual respect and cooperation if the goals of global education and law-related education are to realized.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Richard E. Gross, "The Status of the Social Studies in the Public Schools of the United States: Facts and Impressions of a National Survey," Social Education (March, 1977), p. 196.

[2] Celestino Fernandez, Grace Massey and Sanford Dornbusch, "High School Students' Perceptions of Social Studies," The Social Studies (March/April, 1976), pp. 51-57.

[3] Jean Tilford Claugus, "The Fourth 'R'," Social Education (March, 1976), p. 150.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Gross, op. cit., p. 200.

[6] Ibid., p. 205.

[7] Ibid., p. 199.

[8] John Jarolimek, "The Status of Social Studies Education: Six Case Studies," Social Education (November/December, 1977), pp. 574-79. For individual case studies, see pp. 580-601.

[9] Ibid., pp. 575-76.

[10] Robert D. Barr, James L. Barth, and S. Samuel Shermis, Defining the Social Studies, Bulletin 51 (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977), p. 1.

[11] Ibid., p. 10.

[12] Shirley H. Engle, "Reactors' Comments: Comments of Shirley H. Engle," in ibid., p. 103.

[13] Ibid., pp. 103-04.

[14] Dale L. Brubaker, Alternative Directions for the Social Studies (Scranton, Penna.: International Textbook Company, 1967).

[15] Dale L. Brubaker, Lawrence H. Simon and Jo Watts Williams, "A Conceptual Framework for Social Studies Curriculum and Instruction," Social Education (March, 1977), pp. 201-05.

[16] Barr et al., op. cit., p. 2.

[17]Martin Mayer, Where, When and Why?: Social Studies in the American Schools (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), pp. 9 -99.

[18]Engle, op. cit., p. 103.

[19]Fred Newmann, "Building a Rationale for Civic Education," Unpublished paper presented at an Invitational Conference of the National Council for the Social Studies, Indianapolis, March, 1976 (Revised February, 1977), p. 6.

[20]Gross, op. cit., p. 196.

[21]Ibid., p. 200.

[22]Jarolimek, op. cit., p. 576.

[23]Ibid.

[24]M. Eugene Gilliom and Richard C. Remy, "Needed: A New Approach to Global Education," Social Education (October, 1978), p. 499.

[25]Richard C. Remy, "Introduction: The Historical Framework," Citizen Education Today, A draft report of the Office of Education of the United States, 1977, p. 25.

[26]Gilliom and Remy, op. cit., pp. 501-02.

[27]See, for example, Norman Gross, "Law-Related Education: Current Trends, Future Directions," Peabody Journal of Education (October, 1977), pp. 2-5, and Cynthia A. Kelly, "The Current Status of Law-Related Programs in the Schools," Educational Comment (1977), pp. 50-65.

[28]Barr et al., op. cit., p. 70.

[29]Ibid., p. 59.

[30]Ibid., p. 61.

[31]Ibid., p. 60.

[32]Ibid., p. 61.

[33] Isidore Starr, "Law Studies in the Schools Today," Southwestern Journal of Social Education (Fall/Winter, 1975), p. 18.

[34] Ibid.

[35] Judith V. Torney, "The Elementary School Years As An Optimal Period for Learning About International Human Rights," Paper prepared for a symposium of the American Bar Association: Law and the Humanities - Implications for Elementary Education, (May, 1978), p. 5.

[36] Ibid., pp. 6-7.

[37] Charlotte J. Anderson and Lee F. Anderson, "Global Education in Elementary Schools: An Overview," Social Education (January, 1977), p. 34.

[38] Torney, op. cit., pp. 7-8.

[39] Anderson and Anderson, op. cit., p. 36.

[40] Ibid., pp. 36-37.

[41] Isidore Starr, "A Framework for Viewing Law and the Humanities in the Elementary School," Paper prepared for a symposium of the American Bar Association: Law and the Humanities - Implications for Elementary Education (May, 1978), pp. 4-5.

[42] Law in a Free Society, On Freedom: A Curriculum (Santa Monica, California: Law in a Free Society Project, 1974), p. ii.

[43] Torney, op. cit., p. 6.